#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries, LLC ) Plaintiff, ) v. )	1,844,295  TM Reg. B 547,043  2,593,788  2,771,750  3,126,775  Case No. 3,218,078
Boyd Coffee Company ) Defendant. )	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT
) ) )	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

#### COMPLAINT

COMES NOW Plaintiff, Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries, LLC ("Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries"), and for its complaint against Defendant, Boyd Coffee Company ("Boyd Coffee"), states:

#### **PARTIES**

- 1. Plaintiff Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries is a Pennsylvania limited liability company having its principal place of business and registered office at 1101 William Flynn Highway, Glenshaw, Pennsylvania 15116.
- 2. Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries sells distilled spirits, namely Vodka, using its trademark BOYD & BLAIR.
- Defendant Boyd Coffee is an Oregon corporation with its principal place of business and mailing address at 19730 NE Sandy Blvd., Portland, Oregon 97230.

4. On information and belief, in addition to various food products including soup mixes, gravies, and sauces, Defendant has been using its trademark, BOYDS, in association with the advertising and sale of non-alcoholic beverages including coffee, tea, and cocoa primarily in the Pacific Northwest region of the United States including Oregon, Idaho, Washington, northern California, and Montana.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this cause of action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, 1367(a), 2201 (declaratory judgment), and 2202, as well as under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1051 et seq.
- 6. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

7. According to the United States Patent and Trademark records, Defendant is the owner of the following six federal trademark registrations:

BOYDS (Reg. No. 547,042) for "coffee, tea, a preparation of cocoa, chocolate, sugar and milk for making a food beverage; food flavoring extracts and food flavoring compounds; condiments, namely onion salt, garlic salt, onion powder, and prepared mustard; steak sauce; canned soup bases; dehydrated pudding; butterscotch topping for foods; flavoring syrups for food purposes; monosodium glutamate seasoning, and cornstarch".

BOYDS (Reg. No. 1,844,292) for "electric hot beverage brewers and serving pots primarily for commercial use; beverage cups; refreshment

delivery services; dried soup bases and dried soup mixes; coffee, tea, cocoa, and dried gravies; cider mixes.

bood, and arred gravies, order mines

PERCIVAL BOYD'S TEAS OF ORIGIN (Reg. No. 2,593,788) for "tea".

BOYDS COFFEE & design (Reg. No. 2,771,750) for "coffee".

BOYDS TEA & design (Reg. No. 3,126,775) for "tea".

BOYDS & design (Reg. No. 3,218,078) for "coffee cups".

- 8. Defendant Boyd Coffee does not self alcoholic beverages such as vodka or other distilled spirits.
- 9. Boyd is a surname, and is the surname of the founder of Defendant.
- 10. Boyd is also a family name of one of the founders of Plaintiff.
- 11. Because Boyd is a surname, one or more of Defendant's Registrations above were registered only pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1052(f).
- 12. On January 9, 2008, Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries filed an application for registration of its mark BOYD & BLAIR for goods related to distilled spirits, and the mark was allowed for publication by the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO").
- 13. Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries filed the application for registration of its mark BOYD & BLAIR as an "intent-to-use" application because at the time the mark was not being used in commerce.
- 14. Provided Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries' mark BOYD & BLAIR was not opposed during the publication period and a satisfactory statement of use was subsequently filed with the USPTO, the mark would have been accepted for registration on the principal register in a classification of goods separate from any of Defendant Boyd Coffee's classifications.

### Carrier 2005-mi-0026950 SCO collegent Met 16/3 Filled 08/20/2008 Page 4 of 9

- 15. However, by cease and desist letter dated April 25, 2008 to counsel for Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries, Defendant, upon realizing Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries had filed an application for registration of its mark, alleged that "any use of [plaintiff's] mark will infringe, and potentially dilute, Boyd's trademark rights." See exhibit 1 (redacted without attachments).
- 16. By subsequent letter dated May 21, 2008, Defendant Boyd Coffee asked that Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries "abandon its application to register, and its intent to use, the

BOYD & BLAIR mark." See exhibit 2.

- 17. On June 16, 2008, Defendant Boyd Coffee filed a Notice of Opposition with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board of the USPTO ("opposition") to oppose registration of the mark BOYD & BLAIR, alleging that "[Defendant] will be damaged by the use and registration of [Plaintiff's] mark....". See exhibit 3 (redacted without attachments).
- 18. During the pendency of the opposition, Defendant Boyd Coffee rejected a settlement offer by Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries.
- 19. On or about August 15, 2008, Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries began using the mark in commerce and selling vodka in Pennsylvania under the trademark BOYD & BLAIR.
- 20. Now that Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries is using the mark in commerce, the previous : written demands and threats of infringement and dilution, the filing of the trademark opposition proceeding, and the rejection of a settlement offer by Plaintiff have given rise to a case of actual controversy within the jurisdiction of this Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 et seq.
- 21. Therefore, the instant action is for a declaratory judgment that Plaintiff Pennsylvania

  Pure Distilleries has not, through the use of the trademark, BOYD & BLAIR, violated or
  infringed any intellectual property or other right of Defendant Boyd Coffee, including but not
  limited to any alleged trademark rights, and that Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries has not taken any

action that constitutes unfair competition, dilution, or false and/or deceptive advertising or trade practices under federal or state law.

#### COUNT 1

#### DECLARATORY JUDGMENT THAT USE OF THE "BOYD & BLAIR" MARK DOES NOT CONSTITUTE TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT OR UNFAIR COMPETITION UNDER THE FEDERAL LANHAM ACT

- 22. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 23. Defendant's mark is weak and entitled to limited, unexpanded protection because of widespread third party use and because the mark is merely a surname.
- 24. The competing marks form separate overall commercial impressions to the relevant public.
- 25. The goods and services of Plaintiff and Defendant are not related in any manner or circumstance surrounding the marketing such that they are likely to be encountered by the relevant public under circumstances that will give rise to the mistaken belief that they originate from or in some way are associated with or sponsored by the same producer.
- 26. Accordingly, Plaintiff Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries has not violated the Lanham Act because, as above and among other reasons, Plaintiff has not, in connection with any goods or services, used in commerce any word, term, name, symbol, or device, or any combination thereof, or any false designation of origin, false or misleading description of fact, or false or misleading representation of fact, which (A) is likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake, or to deceive as to the affiliation, connection, or association of such person with another person, or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval or his or her goods, services, or commercial activities by another person, or (B) in commercial advertising or promotion, misrepresents the nature,

characteristics, qualities, or geographic origin of his or her or another person's goods, services, or commercial activities.

27. WHEREFORE, Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries respectfully requests this Court to enter judgment declaring that Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries' use of BOYD & BLAIR, in connection with vodka, does not constitute trademark infringement of Defendant's trademarks under any section of the federal Lanham Act.

#### COUNT II

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT THAT USE OF THE "BOYD & BLAIR" MARK DOES NOT CONSTITUTE TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT, UNFAIR COMPETITION, OR FALSE AND/OR DECEPTIVE ADVERTISING OR TRADE PRACTICES UNDER ANY STATE LAW

- 28. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 29. Plaintiff Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries brings this action for declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202, and 1367, as to the relevant rights, liabilities, and obligations of Plaintiff Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries and Defendant Boyd Coffee with respect to any alleged violation of state trademark, unfair competition, and false and/or deceptive advertising laws.
- 30. Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries has not violated any state trademark, unfair competition, or false and/or deceptive advertising laws through the use of its trademark, BOYD & BLAIR, in association with the advertising and sale of its distilled spirit products.
- 31. WHEREFORE, Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries respectfully requests this Court to enter judgment declaring that Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries' use of BOYD & BLAIR, in connection

with the advertising and sale of its vodka, does not violate any of Defendant's rights under any state trademark, unfair competition, or false and/or deceptive advertising laws.

#### COUNT III

# DECLARATORY JUDGMENT THAT USE OF THE "BOYD & BLAIR" MARK DOES NOT CONSTITUTE TRADEMARK DILUTION UNDER THE FEDERAL LANHAM ACT

- 32. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 33. Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries brings this action for declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, as to the relevant rights, liabilities, and obligations of Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries and Defendant Boyd Coffee with respect to the federal Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1051 et. seq., specifically 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c).
- 34. There has been no substantially exclusive use of Defendant's trademarks.
- 35. Defendant's trademarks are not famous.
- 36. The degree of distinctiveness of Defendant's trademarks is extremely small, if any.
- 37. For the above and other reasons, Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries has not violated 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c) through the use of its trademark, BOYD & BLAIR, in association with the advertising and sale of its vodka products.
- 38. WHEREFORE, Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries respectfully requests this Court to enter judgment declaring that Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries' use of BOYD & BLAIR, in connection with its vodka, does not constitute trademark dilution of Defendant's trademarks under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c) or any other section of the federal Lanham Act.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries respectfully requests this Court to enter its judgment:

- 1. Declaring that Plaintiff Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries' use of the trademark,
  BOYD & BLAIR, in association with the advertising and sale of its vodka products, does not
  violate the federal Lanham Act, nor infringe any of Defendant's trademarks;
- 2. Declaring that Plaintiff Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries' use of the trademark, BOYD & BLAIR, in association with the advertising and sale of its vodka products, does not violate any state trademark, unfair competition, or false and/or deceptive advertising laws, nor infringe any of Defendant's trademarks;
- 3. Declaring that Plaintiff Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries' use of the trademark,
  BOYD & BLAIR, in association with the advertising and sale of its vodka products does not
  constitute trademark dilution or violate the federal Lanham Act, specifically 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c).
- 4. Enjoining Defendant Boyd Coffee, its agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and affiliates, and those persons or entities in active concert or participation with them from interfering with Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries' business, or from threatening litigation or otherwise making statements that Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries has infringed or are infringing any rights of Defendant;
- 5. Awarding Plaintiff its costs and attorney's fees incurred in conjunction with this suit; and,
- 6. Awarding Plaintiff any other relief that this Court deems just and proper.

  JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Respectfully submitted,

MCKAY & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

## Cause 2005-04002696DSCOccOroentmet 63 Filed 008/20/2008 Fragge 9 of 9

Kenneth P. McKay PA ID No. 73425 s/Donald J. McKay Donald J. McKay PA ID No. 203132 801 McNeilly Road Pittsburgh, PA 15226 (412)344-6113 (412)344-6114 (fax) don@mckaylaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

s/Kenneth P. McKay

## Case 205-04002695DSDoc@oeume163-2

Filed 08/20/2008 Page 1 of 2

OJS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. ISSE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM 3

best or management	W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W W								
l. (a) PLAINTIFFS Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries, LLC			DEFENDANTS Boyd Coffee Company						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Allegheny			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant						
(EXCEPT IN	U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			NOTE: IN LAND CO		ITIFF CASES ONLY) SES, USE THE LOCA	ATION OF THE LA	AND INVO	LVED.
(c) Attorneys Kenneth P.	McKay, Donald J. McKay			Altomeys peter I	leuser, Kolisch F	fartwell, P.C.			
						·			
McKay & Associates, P.C., 8 (Firm Name	801 McNeilly Rd., Pittsburg D, Address, and Telephone N			520 S.W. Yambill St Attorneys (# Know		land, OK 97204			
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION	(Mace an "X" in Or		łii. Cľ	IZENSHIP OF PRINCI		(	Place an "X" in O re	e Box for Pli	aintifl
U.S. Government				(For Diversity Cases Only)	PTF DEF	and Or	ne Bax for Defenda	nt) PSF DEF	
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government N	ol a Party)	Cit	izon of This State	Fi Fi	Incorporated or Pr of Business in This		F <sup></sup> 4	<b>Г</b> 4
€ 2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity		Cir	zën of Another State	F 2 F 2	incorporated and i		Г.,	۲ ۲
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship	of Pardes In Isem III)	Ch.	zen or Subject of a		of Business in A	Another State		1 4
				oreign CourMry	<u> </u>	Foreign Nation		<u> </u>	<b>┌</b> 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only)				SANKR	INTCU.	OTHERS	TA CLUTES	
CONTRACT 110 Issumanco	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY	10	610 Agriculture		al 28 USC 158	400 State Re		ent
120 M arine	310 Airplane	362 Personal Injury	Ìt	620 Other Food & Drug	423 Widsd	rawal	410 Amitte	st	
130 Miller Act	3/5 Airplane Product Liability	Med, Malpinctice 165 Personal Injury	- [1]	625 Drug Related Seizurs of Property 21 USC 881	28 USC		430 Bunks :		•
140 Negotimble Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	320 Assault, Libel & Stander	Product Hability	.   [	630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck	PROPERTY F		460 Deport		ad and
151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers'	368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product	'   Ի	650 Airbine Roys.	B20 Cops 830 Pagen	-	Corrupt	Organization	
152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liabliky 340 M army	Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY		660 Occupational Safety/Health	X 840 Trade	ī	480 Consur 490 Cable/S		
(Excl. Veterans)	345 Marine Product	370 Other Fraud	L	§ 590 Other	1 " "		810 Selectives	vs Service	Keif
of Veteran's Benefits	Liability  150 M olar Vehicle	371 Touth in Lending 180 Other Personal	F	710 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECT		" Exchange	e	
160 Stockholders' Suits	158 M otor Vehicle Product Liability	Property Damage 385 Property Damage	l'r	Act 720 Labor/Mgmt, Helations		Lang (923) C/DIWW (405(g))	875 Custom 12 USC 3	er Challeng 410	je
195 Contract Product Liability	360 Other Personal	Product Liability	-	730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	? 864 SSID	Title XVI	890 Other S	tatulory Act	tions
196 Pranchisa REAL PROPERTY	injury CIVIL RIGITS	PRISONER PETITIONS	—  r-	& Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act	FEDERAL TA		891 Agricul		тол Асі
210 Land Condemnation	441 Voling	510 Mulions to Vacate		790 Other Labor Litigation	870 Taxes	(U.S. Plaintiff dant)	893 Enviro 894 Energy		
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lesse & Ejectment	442 Employment	Sentence Habeas Corpus:		791 Himpl Ret. Inc. Security Act	871 1R3-T	had Party	895 Freedor		
240 Toris to Land	443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare	530 General	- 🗀	IMMIGRATION	26 USC 7	1609	Act 900Appeal	of Fee Dele	minution
245 Test Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	535 Donth Penalty 540 Mandamus & Othe	.   🖺	462 Naturulization Application 463 Haboss Corpus-Alien	P	ł	Under Eq	val Access	
	Employment	550 Civil Rights	1	Detainen			to Justice		,
	446 Amer, w/Disabilaties - Other [440 Other Civil Rights	555 Prison Condition	_	465 Other Immigration Actions			State Stat	utes	
V. ORIGIN  (Place an XC in Once Excoonly)  [X 1] Original Proceeding  Tansferred from State Court  Appeal to District  Appeal to District  Appeal to District  Appeal to District  Generated or sanother district (specify)  Transferred from Auditidistrict (specify)  Transferred from (specify)  Appeal to District  Judge from Magistrate  Judgment									
u californe actions	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute	under which you are fili	ng (Do :	i iot cite jurisdictional s	tatutes unless di	(versity): 15 U.S	S.C. 1051 et sec	4-	
Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes onless diversity):    Declaratory judgment of non-infringement of trademark, no unfair competition, no trademark dilution									
/II. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	A CLASS ACTION	DI	MAND \$		ECK YES only if RY DEMAND:	demanded in	compla No	
/III. RELATED CASE(: IF ANY	S) (See instructions):	JUDGE		1	DOCKET	NUMBER			
DATE 8/20/2	Z 008	SIGNATURE OF ATTORN	ey of re	CORD D	191	my C	> 		
ON 151 FILE WAS LIGHT?									
RECEIPT# A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUI	DCIE		

#### JS 44AREVISED OCTOBER, 1993

#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

THIS CASE DESIGNATION SHEET MUST BE COMPLETED

PART A			
	belongs on the Free Johnstov CALENDAR - If cause of action arose in the counties		
О	r Warren, OR any plaintiff or defendant resides in one	of said counties.	
	TOWN CALENDAR - If cause of action arose in OR any plaintiff or defendant resides in one of said countie	the counties of Bedford, Blair, Cumbria, Clearfield of	r
3. Comple	te if on ERIE CALENDAR: I certify that the cause of ac	ction arose inC	ounty and
	that the res	ides in Co	ounty.
4. Comple	te if on JOHNSTOWN CALENDAR: I certify that the	cause of action arose in	County
and tha	t the resi	des in CD	unty.
	(You are to check ONE of the following	g	
1. J_	This case is related to Number	Judge	
2. 💢	This case is not related to a pending or terminated case. IONS OF RELATED CASES:		
same issu		ates to property included in another suit or involves to another suit or involves the validity or infringement	
EMINENT lend then HABEAS	DOMAIN: Cases in contiguous closely located g nselves to consolidation for trial shall be deemed r	itions filed by the same individual shall be deeme	
PARTC			
1. CIVIL	CATEGORY (Place x in only applicable category	ry).	
1.	Antitrust and Securities Act Cases		
2.	Labor-Management Relations		
3	Habeas Corpus		
4.	Civil Rights		
5.	Patent, Copyright, and Trademark		
б.	Eminent Domain		
7.	All other federal question cases		
8.	•••	cases, including maritime, FELA, Jones Act, Motor malicious prosecution, and false arrest	
9,	Insurance indemnity, contract and other dive	ijsity cases.	
10.	VA Overpayment, Overpayment of Social	include HEW Student Loans (Education), Security, Enlistment Overpayment (Army, Navy, etc.), gage Foreclosures, <b>5.8A.</b> Loans, <b>Civil</b> Penalties and	
1 certi	fy that to the best of my knowledge the entries on th		
DATE _	8/70/08 attorney attorney at	LAW Dagny3	
NOTE;	ALL SECTIONS OF BOTH SIDES MUST BE	COMPLETED BEFORE CASE CAN BE	

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania Pure Distilleries, LLC	SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION
V.	SUMMONS IN A CIVITA ACTION
Boyd Coffee Company	CASE NUMBER:
TO: (Name and address of Defendant)	
Boyd Coffee Company 19730 NE Sandy Boulevard Portland, OR 97230	
YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to serve	on PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY (name and address)
Donald J. McKay 801 McNeilly Road Pittsburgh, PA 15226	
an answer to the complaint which is served on you with this summ	nons, within 20 days after service
of this summons on you, exclusive of the day of service. If you	fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the the parties to this action must be filed with the Clerk of this Court
CLERK	DATE
(By) DEPUTY CLERK	DATE

#### 

OAO 440 (Rev. 8/01) Summons in a Civil Action	
RETURN OI	FSERVICE
Service of the Summons and complaint was made by me(1)	DATE
NAME OF SERVER (PRINT)	TITLE
Check one box below to indicate appropriate method of service	10
Served personally upon the defendant. Place where served	ved
☐ Left copies thereof at the defendant's dwelling house or residing therein.  Name of person with whom the summons and complain	usual place of abode with a person of suitable age and discretion then
□ Returned unexecuted:	
□ Other (specify):	
STATEMENT OF S	FRVICE FEES
TRAVEL SERVICES	TOTAL
DECLARATION	OF SERVER
I declare under penalty of perjury under the law contained in the Return of Service and Statement of Service Executed on	ws of the United States of America that the foregoing information e Fees is true and correct.
Date Signature of S	erver
Address of Serv	ver

<sup>(1)</sup> As to who may serve a summons see Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedule.